



## 危险物品专家组 (DGP)

### 第三十次会议

2025 年 10 月 6 日至 10 日，蒙特利尔

- 议程项目 2: 管理航空特有的安全风险和查明异常情况 (REC-A-DGS-2027)
- 2.2: 如有必要，拟定对《危险物品安全航空运输技术细则》(Doc 9284 号文件) 的修订提案，以便纳入 2027 年—2028 年版

### 爆炸物分类程序

(由 E Gillett 提交)

#### 摘要

本文件旨在阐明生产商和相关国家主管部门在爆炸物分类方面的职责，并协助托运人遵守分类所依据的包装条件。

**危险物品专家组的行动：**请危险物品专家组审议本工作文件附录中所示的对《技术细则》第 2 部分第 1 章的修订。

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Potential ambiguities in the procedures for classifying explosives contained in Part 2;1 of the Technical Instructions in relation to whether classification was to be determined by the shipper or an appropriate national authority were discussed at the Dangerous Goods Panel Working Group Meetings in 2024 (DGP-WG/24, 21 to 25 October 2024, Montreal) and 2025 (DGP-WG/25, 21 to 25 April 2025, Delhi, India) (see paragraphs 4.1.2.3 of the DGP-WG/24 Report and 4.2.2.1 of the DGP-WG/25 Report). The consensus at DGP-WG/24 was that the involvement of an appropriate national authority in the explosives classification process was necessary and was the intent of the UN Model Regulations and Technical Instructions.

---

\* 仅提供了摘要和附录的翻译。

1.2 A proposed amendment to the Technical Instructions requiring the involvement of an appropriate national authority was developed based on the discussions at DGP-WG/24 and presented to DGP-WG/25. A recommendation that manufacturers and subsequent distributors of explosive substances and articles make available the classification to enable subsequent shippers to verify that the original classification remain valid in the event of the explosives being repacked, for example in smaller quantities for subsequent distribution was also proposed. While there was support for these objectives, the working group did not reach consensus on the approach taken in the proposal to achieve this. There were concerns that some States excepted some explosive divisions from classification involving an appropriate competent authority, and perceived implications that if classifications were recommended to be made available, a physical classification document might be expected over an electronic classification record and handling agents might arbitrarily demand the classification. Interested members agreed to work together to develop a proposal for competent authority involvement in classification and on ensuring that packaging used for re-packaged explosives was compliant based on their original classification for DGP/30. This working paper is raised based on the informal discussions held since DGP-WG/25.

1.3 With regards to subsequent shippers verifying that a classification made for explosives received remained valid in the event of the goods being repacked for subsequent distribution, the informal group considered that this was best dealt with by supplementing the note after 2;1.5.1.3:

*Note. — The importance of this can be overlooked unless it is realized that a relatively minor change in an inner or outer packaging can be critical and can convert a lesser hazard into a mass explosion hazard.*

With “Consequently, if the explosives are repacked for subsequent distribution, the shipper will need to verify that the proposed packaging is permitted by the original classification or re-apply the classification procedure prescribed in this chapter.” It was felt that this achieved the objective without any need to recommend that the classification be made available to subsequent shippers.

1.4 With regards to the classification of explosives, the regulations of many States require a classification by their national authority for explosives travelling to, from or within their territory. Other States allow classifications that have been reached with the involvement of the national authority of another State. It is reasonable for States to determine which model is appropriate based on their capabilities and assessment of the risks involved. For this reason, the proposal in paragraph 2 is for the insertion of ‘1.5.1.4 Prior to transport, the explosive classification must have been conducted, approved or accepted by an appropriate national authority’ (it does not specify that the national authority must be of the same State as the manufacturer or shipper, etc. as such matters can be decided by each State). The revised wording also intends to provide for circumstances such as when the State excludes certain commodities such as small arms ammunition from the classification procedure and allows the shipper to assign a default classification or authorizes a private entity to issue a temporary classification for transport for the purposes of performing the classification procedure elsewhere.

## 2. ACTION BY THE DGP

2.1 The DGP is invited to consider the amendments to Part 2, Chapter 1 of the Technical Instructions shown in the appendix to this working paper.

— — — — —

## 附录

### 对《技术细则》的拟议修订

## 第 2 部分 危险物品的分类

.....

### 第 1 章

.....

#### 1.5 爆炸品的分类

.....

1.5.1.3 除按其运输专用名称列入危险物品表（表 3-1）中的物质外，未经本章描述的分类程序，物品不得作为第 1 类物品提交运输。此外，分类程序必须在新产品提交运输之前进行。在这里，新产品是国家有关当局认为具有下列任何一种情况的产品：

- a) 新爆炸性物质或被认为同已分类的其他组合物和混合物有重大区别的爆炸性物质组合或混合物；
- b) 新设计的物品或含有新爆炸性物质、爆炸性物质的新组合或混合物的物品；
- c) 新设计的爆炸性物质或物品包装件，包括新类型的内包装。

注：这一情况的重要性可能被忽视，除非意识到内包装或外包装所做的较小改变可以是关键性的，并可以使较小的危险变为整体爆炸危险。因此，若爆炸物需要重新包装以供后续分发，则托运人需要核实拟采用的包装是否符合原始分类要求，或重新执行本章规定的分类程序。

#### 1.5.1.4 在运输前，必须由相关国家主管部门完成、批准或接受爆炸物的分类。

1.5.1.4<sup>5</sup> 申请对产品进行分类的产品制造商或其他人必须提供关于产品中所有爆炸性物质名称和性质的充分资料，必须提供所有已经做过的相关试验结果。其前提条件是新型物品中的所有爆炸性物质已做适当的试验并获得批准。

.....